

The indefinite metric problem revisited and chased away.

A. B. van Oosten

Laboratory of Chemical Physics, University of Groningen, The Netherlands

Received: date / Revised version: date

Abstract. Attempts to quantize light in a manifestly Lorentz covariant manner fail because of the indefinite metric problem. Here an error in the interpretation is uncovered that is at the root of this problem.

PACS. 03.50.De – 42.50.-p

1 Problem

The manifestly covariant approach to the quantisation of electrodynamics interpretes A^μ and $A^{\mu+}$ as photon annihilation and creation operators with commutation relation [1]

$$[A^\mu(\mathbf{k}), A^{+\nu}(\mathbf{k}')] = g^{\mu\nu} \delta(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}'). \quad (1)$$

A single photon state with polarization μ and momentum $\mathbf{k}$ is constructed by operating $A^{+\mu}(k)$ on the vacuum state $|0\rangle$. The in-product of two single photon states is

$$\begin{aligned} \langle 0 | A^\mu(\mathbf{k}) A^{+\nu}(\mathbf{k}') | 0 \rangle &= \langle 0 | [A^\mu(\mathbf{k}), A^{+\nu}(\mathbf{k}')] | 0 \rangle \\ &= g^{\mu\nu} \delta(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}') \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

For $\mu = \nu = 0$ this is a negative definite quantity which invalidates Eq. 2 as a normalization condition and is inconsistent with the interpretation of $A^{+\mu}(\mathbf{k})|0\rangle$ as a single time-like photon state. In-depth discussions of this problem are given in Refs. [2,3]. Ref. [3] even uses a non-covariant approach throughout the text because of this issue.

2 Solution

First the meaning of the notation A^μ must be clarified. It may denote the μ -component of a Minkovski vector, that is, a number. The same symbol also denotes a Minkovski vector polarized along the μ direction.

It is an improvement to write $A^{(\mu)}$ for the vector, but the notation must also distinguish a contravariant vector with components $A^{(\mu)\lambda}$ from a covariant one with components $A_\lambda^{(\mu)}$. The polarization can also be along the contravariant μ -direction, in which case one should write $A_{(\mu)}^\lambda$ or $A_{(\mu)\lambda}$.

In the proposed notation a single photon state is either the contravariant $A^{+(\mu)\lambda}(\mathbf{k})|0\rangle$ or the covariant $A_\lambda^{+(\mu)}(\mathbf{k})|0\rangle$. The crucial question is: which bra state belongs to this ket state? In Eq. 2 covariant bra states are

combined with contravariant ket states, or vice versa. By this choice the infamous minus sign is tacitly introduced.

A *positive definite* norm is obtained by combining the contravariant ket state, $A^{+(\mu)\lambda}(\mathbf{k})|0\rangle$, with the again contravariant bra state $\langle 0 | A^{(\mu)\lambda}(\mathbf{k})$, or, likewise, by combining covariant bra and ket states. This norm is

$$\langle 0 | A^{(\mu)\lambda}(\mathbf{k}) A^{+(\nu)\lambda}(\mathbf{k}') | 0 \rangle, \quad (3)$$

It takes the covariant form $g_\nu^\mu \delta(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}')$, because $A^{+(\mu)\lambda} = A_{(\mu)\lambda}^+$.

3 Conclusion

The indefinite metric problem is merely a confusion caused by ambiguous notation. The covariant quantization procedure is physically sound after all. It is perhaps surprising that the fundamentals of field theory are still subject to improvement.

References

1. The convention $g^{\mu\nu} = \text{diag}(-1, 1, 1, 1)$ is adopted.
2. F. Mandl and G. Shaw: Quantum Field Theory (Wiley, Chichester, 1984).
3. C. Cohen-Tannoudji, J. Dupont-Roc and G. Grynberg: Photons and Atoms (Wiley, New York, 1989).